

REMARKS

Thorough examination of the application is sincerely appreciated.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,772,438 (hereinafter, Blackketter). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Blackketter discloses a method and apparatus for retrieving data from broadcast signal to allow a single television broadcast signal to support multiple types of television receivers (see col. 2, lines 61-64 of the patent). Applicant's claimed invention, on other hand, is directed to a method and apparatus for recording or replaying a television program and a web content. As the very first matter, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's claimed invention is directed to an entirely different subject matter than Blackketter.

According to the Final Office Action, Blackketter's receiver 200 is coupled to a video storage device 204, which store(s) the television signals and the other data, as disclosed at col. 4, lines 30-31 of the patent (Final Office Action, page 3, bullet point 3). It is further stated in the same paragraph of the Final Office Action that the "trigger" synchronizes the "other data" with the television signal, as disclosed at col. 2, lines 28-39 of the patent. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this characterization of the prior art reference as it allegedly applies to Applicant's invention.

According to Blackketter, the "trigger" is used to **display** the web page content at a particular time in the television video (see col. 2, lines 33-39 of the patent reproduced below for the Examiner's convenience):

Later, when the web page content is to **be displayed** at a particular time in the television video, a "trigger" that identifies the web page content (e.g., by file

name) is broadcast to the television receiver. When the trigger is received, the associated web page content **is retrieved** from the local storage device and displayed on the television screen. (emphasis added)

Contrary to the assertion in the Final Office Action, Blackketter's trigger is not used to store the web page content: the trigger is merely used as a timing signal (even the term itself, "trigger", implies the timing as known to those skilled in the art) to start retrieving the web page content during the video signal. Nowhere does Blackketter teach or suggest Applicant's feature of "**synchronizing for storing** in a memory said television program and said downloaded web content" as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

Furthermore, Blackketter teaches encoding of data, such as web page content for example, in Vertical Blanking Interval (VBI) lines (see col. 2, lines 26-31 of the patent reproduced below for the Examiner's convenience):

VBI lines 10-20 are available for a higher-speed communication sub-channel for the communication of data. **Data can be encoded in VBI lines 10-20 at a data rate sufficient to communicate web page content along with the television content being transmitted.** The web page content is received and stored locally in the television receiver for future access (emphasis added).

According to Blackketter, it is clear that the web page content and television content are transmitted via the same medium, NTCS signal in North America for example, as known to skilled artisans. Nowhere does Blackketter teach or suggest Applicant's feature of "said television program received via a first medium from the TV broadcaster and said downloaded web content received via a second medium from said web server" as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

As it appears and until rebutted by the Examiner, Blackketter fails to teach or suggest, among other things, Applicant's features as discussed hereinabove. Any analogy between Blackketter's disclosure (as reproduced above) and Applicant's recitation in claim 1 does not have any factual basis in the record.

Pursuant to MPEP, Section 2131, to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. As discussed above, Blackketter fails to teach every element of Applicant's claim 1. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Blackketter. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 8 and 13, as amended, contain the features of claim 1 as discussed above. Applicant essentially repeats the same argument as above with reference to claim 1 and asserts that claims 8 and 13 are also allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 2-7, 9-12 and 14-17 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 8 and 13 and thus incorporate novel and non-obvious features thereof, in addition to further limitations. Therefore, dependent claims 2-7, 9-12 and 14-17 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the same reasons as independent claims. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.


In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that Blackketter does not anticipate or render obvious the present invention because the prior art reference fails to teach or suggest all of the features of the present invention, as discussed hereinabove.

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Final Office Action and advance the prosecution of this case. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason this application is not considered to be in

condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Yuri Kateshov, Reg. No. 34,466
914-723-6802